



In McMurtry, the outer tuber 14 is metallic and the filler between the inner and outer tubes is “a slag resisting material 18, such as carbon impregnated magnesia grain (column 2, lines 40-42), filled by “pitch” (column 3, lines 16-18) and finally bonded by a “suitable resin such as liquid furfuryal alcohol polymer” (column 3, lines 25-27). Such a binder system will break down at a temperatures well below the sintering temperature of the refractory aggregate in the filler. As a result, all other fillers will become friable and lose their shape at temperatures in the range between 600°C and 800°C. if the outer sheath has been consumed, as is often the case, the filler will simply disappear.

In contrast to McMurtry, the filler in accordance with the present invention is a low temperature sintering refractory material including particulate borosilicate and boric acid powder . In this case, sintering occurs at only 780°C and shape integrity is maintained. Thus, unlike McMurtry (and unlike every other protection system known to the inventor), the thermocouple remains protected throughout the required temperature range. Regarding the composition of the filler in accordance with the present invention and the effect produced by borosilicate and boric acid powder, reference should be made generally to the description beginning at page 5, line 1 of the application.

Moreover, the Examiner admits that McMurtry does not disclose a refractory material with the claimed composition. She does, however, cite Francis, which discloses a ceramic foam, in one embodiment of which a mixture of bonding materials is used which contains calcium aluminate cement, boric acid powder, zinc borosilicate frit and hydrochloric acid. Francis describes the purpose of the bonding material as follows:

The refractory made in accordance with the method of the present invention requires a bond which sets up rapidly enough to stabilize the foam to prevent collapse but not so rapidly as to prevent placement of the slurry in the desired mold. Additionally, the bond must be resistant to attack molten metal, salts or gasses with which it comes into contact.

Unquestionably, this is an entirely different purpose than the present invention.

Clearly, being related to a ceramic foam, Francis is not within the present inventor's field of endeavor. Furthermore, Francis deals with the problem of preventing a foam from collapsing, not with providing a durable insulation for a thermocouple structure. Accordingly, Francis could not be said to be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the present inventor was involved. In order to determine whether a prior art reference is not analogous and thus not relevant to determining obviousness, it must be determined (1) whether the reference is "within the field of the inventor's endeavor" and (2) if not, whether the reference is "reasonable pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved." *In re Deminski*, 796 F.2d 436, 230 U.S.P.Q. 2d 313 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In as much as Francis meets neither of the two requirements set forth in *In re Deminski*, it is clearly nonanalogous art. "The combination of elements from nonanalogous sources, in a manner that reconstructs the applicant's invention only with the benefit of hindsight, is insufficient to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness." *In re Oetiker*, 977, F.2d 1443, 24 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). This is clearly what the Examiner has done here. As a matter of law, the Examiner has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the present instance. Specifically, the Examiner has no basis for rejecting the structure set forth in claim 22. Claim 22 should therefore be allowed. Claims 26-28 and 37, and 39 depend from claim 22 and are believed to be allowable based upon their dependence from an allowable claim.

Claims 23-25, 29-32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 were rejected as obvious over McMurtry, Hall, Francis and further in view of Kilp. This rejection is respectfully traversed. None of the references, nor any combination thereof renders the present claims obvious.

The Examiner cited Kilp for its disclosure of a device having a protective shield for a thermoelectric device including two tubes with a refractory ceramic inserted between them.

Initially, it is noted that Kilp does not provide additional disclosure to cure the defects of McMurtry, Hall and Francis, in combination, as the basis for an obviousness rejection, as discussed above. On the contrary, the Examiner relies on that combination to formulate the combination



Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that this application, as a whole, receive favorable reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any under unanswered questions, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: November 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant